DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 422 SO 017 362

AUTHOR Lynch, James
TITLE Changing Attitudes: Prejudice and the Schools.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Multicultural Education after Swann (Sunderland, England, March, 1986). For documents by the same author on related topics, see SO 017 360-361.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Pluralism; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Holistic Approach; *Multicultural Education; *Racial Bias; Teacher Education; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The paper begins with the supposition that schools in Great Britain have been given the task of developing an ethos and teaching/learning approaches which may reduce and eradicate racism and other prejudices in education and the wider society. Prejudice is defined and 25 practical initiatives for combatting it through multicultural education are outlined, including the ideas of Stenhouse, Jeffcoate, Banks, and Twitchin and Demuth. Further research is suggested to reduce prejudice and three areas for further study have been identified: personality, social structure, and cultural dimensions of prejudice and racism. Finally, 14 guiding principles are identified to help establish policies for multicultural education by teachers. A three-page select bibliography is included. (JEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272422

MAR 1986
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

CHANGING ATTITUDES: PREJUDICE AND THE SCHOOLS

by

Professor James Lynch

Presented to a Conference

on

Multicultural Education After Swann

at

Sunderland Polytechnic

March 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James Lynch
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP017362

Changing Attitudes: Prejudice and the Schools

It is a truism, that for as long as the policies and strategies to eradicate racism in British society address Black Britons, they are unlikely to alter or improve the racist attitudes of the majority of the population. At the very least the Swann Report has placed that recognition on the agenda. The corollary of that recognition is that unless racism is accepted as a major explicator of the problems of victimized visible minorities, progress in adopting coherent and effective approaches to prejudice reduction in education and the broader society is likely to prove elusive.

In this paper I want to imagine that schools have been given the task of developing an ethos and teaching/learning approaches which may reduce and eradicate racism and other prejudices in education and the wider society. I want to ask the question, on the basis of our currently very limited understanding of what prejudice is and how it can be attentuated, what guidance can be offered to enable teachers to educate for prejudice reduction.

Firstly, however, what do we mean by prejudice. In its literal sense, prejudice is the holding of a belief or opinion without adequate rational grounds or in the face of rational evidence to the contrary of that belief or opinion. Such prejudice may focus on persons or things. It may be for or against them. Thus, prejudice is not *a priori* a hostile or negative opinion - we may be prejudiced for (a person or thing) as well as against. Moreover, we all have prejudices. The question, thus arises, what kinds of prejudices have to be combatted and when.

As teachers, we expect pupils in schools to make discriminations, ranging from placing objects into sets, thus categorizing them, to differentiation between discriminable stimuli and alternative good and bad behaviours. Children are not expected to categorize as identical, phenomena for which there are rational grounds for discrimination. Thus, the task of educators and schools is to enable children to achieve the rational bases, information,techniques, views, attitudes and strategies which will enable them to categorize on the basis of rational evidence, whilst avoiding stereotypical representations and prejudiced opinions, particularly - as far as this paper is concerned - in the areas of race, social class, sex, creed and ethnicity. In other words, we expect children to be able to make some discriminations, whilst avoiding others. It is those prejudices which offend against the moral basis of society and are likely to be inimical to its ethic and thus destructive of its social cohesion if translated into overt attitudes and behaviour, which need to be countered. That need for action is reinforced when a preconceived and stereotypical representation of a particular group or individual may cause us to act in what we call a discriminatory manner

towards those individuals or groups.

There are, however, two problems with that formulation: firstly, far from combatti stereotypes and prejudices, education, colluding with other agencies such as the media, currently propagates and reinforces them, whether in the field of sex stereotyping, ethnic pride, racial derivation or social status. Indeed, social class and religious categorisation is fundamental to the very social organisation of our society, its political structure and its education system. Secondly, in an era of instrumental as opposed to theological regulation of human behaviour, it is difficult, but by no means impossible, to get agreement on the basic ethics of a multicultural society, which would then enable us to decide which prejudices to counter and why. Can, for example, education for national pride be a source of prejudice against other ethnic groups.

It is only with fundamental changes in the broader society, its political structur and educational provision, as a whole, that improvement is likely to be achieved in overcoming those prejudices which are destructive of society itself and inimical to its moral bases. Education can only solve educational problems. But the individual teacher and school do have an important role to play, and they have to make moral decisions. I have argued elsewhere two major ways in which the basis for moral behaviour in a multicultural society may be arrived at (Lynch, 1983, 198 There are, no doubt, other ways. The important point here is that the decision about what prejudice to tackle in schools is a moral one, insofar as it derives from what is considered to be good and bad, acceptable and unacceptable, positive and negative within a multicultural society.

One final point before I move on to the kinds of strategies which may encourage rational, non-prejudiced opinions and beliefs and help to achieve attitudes and behaviour which do not negatively discriminate on the basis of race, sex, ethnic origins and creed. What a multicultural society is ultimately concerned with is acceptable behaviour - and it is the task of education to provide for the making of individual and group judgements to support that. To achieve that goal, education has to tackle the covert motivators of discriminatory behaviour by concentrating on what is rationally justifiable, acceptable behaviour within our society. Here, there are contrary views. Some argue that if the behaviour is changed, the beliefs will also change. Others assert that the values and attitudes have to be changed so that behaviour will follow. To my mind, teaching for both goals is also tenable. But how? Let me discuss briefly some of the pedagogical work which has attempted to address that task and let us see if it is possible to draw out some guiding principles.

The work of Lawrence Stenhouse in the early 1970s, for example, will be well known to many participants in this Conference. It remains unique in its innovatory contribution to the development of a multicultural education aimed at enhancing

the rational judgement of those being educated. In a book published after his untimely death (Stenhouse, 1984), he sets out what he calls a number of researcher's speculations, and I want to summarise some of these as offering a direct contribution to practical initiatives which need to be borne in mind in the development of strategies for prejudice reduction. They include the following points, which I have paraphrased and re-written for this paper:-

1. Direct teaching to correct for negative racial attitudes can result in positive gains;
2. Strategies compatible with the context and the skills of teachers who are involved are more likely to be successful;
3. The value of 'openmindedness' is likely to transfer from discussion of one controversial issue into other areas;
4. The results of such gains are likely to be non-persistent without reinforcement;
5. Where the pedagogies involve 'appeal to the judgement of participants', they may result in regression in an undesired direction;
6. In the face of racism there is a need for collegiality of decision; and,
7. Only as part of broader social policies and interests, is it likely that tackling racism within the school will be successful.

I am not saying that each of these principles, which I have identified, is directly as Stenhouse has formulated it. What I am sharing with you is the provisional, 'guiding principles', which emerge from Stenhouse's work. If we then add to these 'guiding principles' the principles deriving from the work which others have done, we may be able to begin a brick-by-brick construction of a pedagogy of multicultural education which can come to grips with issues of prejudice reduction.

Let us, for example, look at the work of Jeffcoate (1976, 1979a, 1979b), who was perhaps the first in this country to set out a series of cognitive and affective objectives for a multicultural and multiracial curriculum. As his work has been amended by Cohen and Manion (1983) and Lynch (1986), it includes not only cognitive skills (it is important for cognitive knowledge to be transmitted in order to correct for misinformation), but it also includes affective attitudes and values and emotional sets. The important contribution here is the recognition that prejudice is comprised of emotionality and emotional dimensions as well as cognitive ones, and that any curriculum, to be effective, has to include both dimensions.

So let us add two more principles to our collection:

8. Educational strategies for prejudice reduction will need to adopt cognitive strategies for example, to correct for misinformation;

9. Prejudice reduction has an essential affective dimension.

Walkling (1980) raises basic ethical issues concerning the principles for the selection of content which will enable fair and just judgements to be made about what should be included within the content of the multicultural curriculum, what kinds of procedures might be involved and what kinds of purposes such a curriculum might address. Drawing up a series of continuua between tolerance and selection in the case of content; relativism and absolutism in the case of procedures; and transition or transformation in the case of purposes, he sets out a typology which clarifies the complexity of decision-making in this area. Using his terms, prejudice reduction strategies are likely to be selective, relativist and transformational.

The eminent American author, Banks (1981, 1984), adds to our criteria by identifying and clarifying underlying principles which must be addressed if multicultural education is to be successfully implemented. These include the following principles:

10. The strategies must be holistic and include the total school environment;

11. There must be a permeation of the purposes, values and attitudes of multiculturalism into every facet of the school's functioning;

12. The measures must be comprehensive in scope and sequence;

13. This will necessitate multi-disciplinary approaches and multi-directionality in purposes;

14. The principles involved will encompass and embrace mutual and multiple acculturation of pupil and teacher by each other in a process of cultural reciprosity;

15. Approaches must include positive multiethnic interactions with significant others;

16. The staff composition must reflect ethnic pluralism;

17. Learning styles must take account of the ethnic pluralism of the school;

18. Continuous efforts are needed including systematic reinforcement;

19. Pedagogical strategies must address decision-making and social-actioning capacities and competences;

20. The curriculum must aim at strengthening the intercultural competence of pupils;

21. There will need to be a maximum involvement of, and use of, local community resources, including languages;

22. It goes without saying that an overall holistic strategy will include not only assessment strategies of pupils, but the evaluation of programmes, teachers and institutions; and,

23. The whole strategy has to be seen within the context of the development of not only community and national, but also global, multicultural competences.

Such principles, it seems to me, afford useful benchmarks to institutions and schools who themselves are embarking on the long and difficult road of planning, implementing and evaluating their own strategies of multicultural education which arise from the cultural biography of their own institution, community and societal context.

If we add to this other principles, such as those inherent within the series of BBC programmes addressing issues of racism (Twitchin and Demuth, 1985) drawing our attention to the fact that at the core of any effective strategy of multi-cultural education has to be a commitment to staff development which starts where the teachers are now and their current attitudes and knowledge, then we may add two further principles to our list, namely:

24. That any strategy for prejudice reduction must include the sensitive exploration of the feelings of institutional racism of both pupils and teachers; and,

25. It must aim to achieve cognitive increments of understanding and knowledge of the phenomenon of institutional racism.

Such principles, however, need to be seen within the broader context of research and writing within the field of prejudice acquisition for it is naive to assume that it is possible to achieve prejudice reduction without an understanding of how prejudice is, in the first instance, acquired. There are basically <u>three domains</u> of research and writing in this area, those emphasising <u>personality</u>, those emphasising <u>social structural</u> causation of prejudice, and those emphasising <u>cultural dimensions</u> of racism and prejudice acquisition. I do not have sufficient time in this brief talk to go into these three domains in detail. Suffice to say that it is now recognised that only those categories and approaches which take into account all three causative domains are likely to achieve success, i.e. prejudice reduction. By prejudice reduction I mean "a deliberate and systematic process which aims, by means of coherent and sustained educational and broader social strategies, policies and practices, at enabling individuals and groups to re-orient their values and attitudes, actions and behaviour, in such a way that their predisposition to negatively discriminate is attentuated or eradicated.

One further point is necessary before I move on briefly to discuss possible change strategies which have been adopted and to propose a brief list of tentative and provisional principles. Firstly, as Merton (1976) has pointed out, it is quite possible for a person who is not him or herself prejudiced to be a discriminator. The circumambient values of the institution or society may exercise an influence which produces in the non-prejudiced, well-intentioned person false stereotypes, or even on occasions merely silence, either of which may enhance and facilitate the perpetration of discrimination on the basis of race, sex, class or creed. It is therefore important for strategies of prejudice reduction to bear in mind these major dimensions of prejudice: individual, structural and cultural; and to incorporate this insight into the design of pedagogical initiatives to correct for prejudice.

Turning now to some of the change strategies of which we have details, and which may provide nodal points for the development of more overarching approaches to the eradication of prejudice. Here, we are faced with a wide variety of disparate, unconnected and non-continuous approaches, including the matching of change strategies and pedagogocal principles, strategies at pre-school level, teaching through drama, attempts at change by discourse, role playing and simulation exercises, the production of materials and packs, the encouragement of teachers to study their own practice and expand the criteria for the judgement of their own professional actions and judgements and attempts to introduce multicultural education to correct for prejudice by predominantly cognitive means, both in the schools and in teacher education. Indeed, Gay (1982) argues that education needs to aim at higher levels of intellectual functioning and social and moral perspective-taking for there is evidence that those who achieve these higher levels are less likely to be involved in prejudiced social behaviour.

Whilst a number of academics, including Gibson, Williams, Lynch and others have attempted to draw maps of these initiatives, we have as yet no complete cartographical survey of the initiatives which have been taken so far, let alone systematic and scientific theories for prejudice reduction.

The upshot of the brief excursion which I have been able to share with you today is no more than a series of tentative and provisional reflections, identifying possible guiding principles for the establishment of policies of multicultural education by teachers in schools. I would summarise there briefly as follows:

1. A recognition of the central role of staff development, starting from where teachers are now and including their own study of their own practice;

2. The need for teachers to extend the criteria by which they judge their own practice and to extend their frame of reference for such judgement;

3. The need for inclusive, comprehensive, systematic, continuous and holistic school approaches;

4. Multidimensional and interdisciplinary pedagogical approaches are necessary including interconnected and coherent phases of reinforcement, addressing higher levels of mental functioning;

5. Pedagogical initiatives need to be reflective of the cultural, racial and linguistic biography of the school and society;

6. Strategies need to be true to the underlying ethical principles which may be derived either from philosophical speculation or from international agreements and covenants and national legislation;

7. Multicultural education must address both cognitive and affective dimensions, if it is to come to terms with the intellectual and emotional dimensions of prejudice;

8. Multicultural education must include positive ethnic interactions with 'significant others' as part of a process of multiple and mutual acculturation of both staff and pupils;

9. Only by means of conceptual and political coalitions can prejudice reduction become an integral part of the curriculum rather than a 'tissue-rejected' attempt at grafting on to it;

10. Holistic strategies must involve all aspects of the school's functioning, including its assessment and evaluation approaches;

11. Living within a democratic society necessarily restricts the initiatives which can be taken to those resting on democratic principles of non-coercion and persuasion, backed up by agreed instrumental regulations;

12. Social actioning within a democratic society will be part of the development of prejudice reduction;

13. Education for prejudice reduction will need to take account of the economic, community and social context;

14. The community has to be recognised as something broader than a local or national one and thus issues of human and civil rights beyond the borders and boundaries of the nation state, including international agreements, covenants and conventions, offer clarification and definition of basic ethical principles.

Clearly, it follows from what I have said that manifestations of racial discrimination and other prejudiced behaviour on the part of pupils and/or teachers should be seen as disciplinary offences and treated accordingly on the basis of an explicit policy and delivery statement. It is important that all

teachers recognise that racist behaviour cannot be tolerated in a multicultural school, for it is incompatible with the ethics of that institution and its society. Whilst the difficulties should not be underestimated (see, for example, Troyna and Ball, 1985), as part of its overall strategy, each school will need to draw up a delivery document which will also include guidelines for teachers on how to react to manifestations of racism and prejudice in their own schools and classrooms. The delivery will need to be collegially supported and organically implemented and evaluated, and that represents a massive job of institution-based INSET. None of us can claim that we are adequately prepared for the complexity of the task implementing education, in a manner which will achieve prejudice reductio and hopefully eradication. Without staff development, there can be no effective education for prejudice reduction ... and without such an education the outlook for our society could be very unhappy!

JL/SM/2/86/122

Note: I am grateful to my colleague, Barry Troyna, for his constructive comments on the draft of this paper.

Select Bibliography

Adelman, C. et al., A Fair Hearing for All: Relationships between Teaching and Racial Equality. Early Reading: Bulmershe College of Higher Education, 1984. Bulmershe Research Publication No. 2.

Adorno, T. et al., The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

All London Teachers against Racism and Fascism (ALTARF), Teaching and Racism. (An ALTARF Discussion Document, 4/c). London: ALTARF, 1978.

Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association, Education for a Multicultural Society, London, AMMA, 1981.

Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association, Our Multicultural Society: The Educational Response. London: AMMA, 1982. See also the report of an AMMA Conference, Positive and Negative Discrimination in Multicultural Britain, London, AMMA, 1983.

Banks, J.A., Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1981, pp.257-279. See also the adaptation in Cohen and Manion, op.cit., pp.191-5.

Banks, J.A., 'Reducing Prejudice in Students: Theory, Research and Strategies'. A paper presented at the Kamloops Spring Institute for Teacher Education, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, February 3, 1982.

Banks, J.A., Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Banks, J.A., Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1984.

Bettleheim, B. and Janowitz, M., Dynamics of Prejudice. New York, Harper, 1950.

Biott, C., Lynch, J. and Robertson, W., 'Supporting Teachers Own Progress Towards Multicultural Education', Multicultural Teaching, Vol.II, No.2, 1984, pp. 39-41.

Birley High School, Multicultural Education in the 1980s. Manchester, City of Manchester Education Committee, 1980.

Blackburn, G., 'An Examination of the Effects of Human Relations on the Attitudes of Certificated In-Service Teachers in Minnesota', University of Washington, Seattle Ph.D. thesis, 1980.

Chapman, T.H., Simulation Game Effects on Attitudes Regarding Racism and Sexism, Maryland University, Cultural Study Centre, Research Report, Vol. 8, No. 74, 1974.

City of Bradford Metropolitan Council Directorate of Educational Services, 'Local Administrative Memorandum 6/83: Racialist Behaviour in Schools'. Bradford, City of Bradford Metropolitan Council, 1984 (November).

Cohen, L. and Manion, L., Multicultural Classrooms. London, Croom Helm, 1983, p.189.

Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, International and Multicultural Education Programme, Working Papers 1-3. Glasgow, Jordanhill College of Education, 1982-85, and Report on the IMEP Conference, 15-16 May, 1984, Glasgow, Jordanhill College of Education, 1985.

Dorn, A. and Troyna, B., 'Multiracial Education and the Politics of Decision Making', Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 8, 1982, pp. 175-185.

Dunbar, L.E., 'The Utilization of Values Clarification in Multicultural Education as a strategy to Reduce Prejudicial Attitudes of Eighth Grade Students', Northern Arizona University Doctoral Thesis, 1980.

Duncan, C., 'Portrait of a Multicultural School: Some Implications for Practice', in Corner T. (ed.), Race and the Curriculum, Glasgow, University of Glasgow Department of Education, 1985, pp. 6-14.

Garcia, R.L., Teaching in a Pluralist Society. New York, Harper and Row, 1982, particularly pp. 81-82.

Gay, G., 'Developmental Prerequisites for Multicultural Education in the Social Studies', in Rosenweig, L.W. (ed.), Developmental Perspectives in the Social Studies. Washington D.C., National Council for the Social Studies, (Bulletin 66), 1982, pp. 67-81.

Hall, S., 'Teaching Race', Multicultural Education, Vol. 9, 1980.

Hall, S., 'The Whites of their Eyes': Racist Ideologies in the Media', in Bridges, G. and Brunt, R. (eds.), Silver Linings, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1981.

Hicks, D., 'Two Sides of the same Coin: An Exploration of Links between Multicultural Education and Development Education', New Approaches to Multiracial Education, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1979, pp. 1-5.

Ijaz, M.A. and Ijaz, I.H., 'A Cultural Program for Changing Racial Attitudes', History and Social Science Teacher, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1981, pp. 17-20.

Jeffcoate, R., 'Curriculum Planning in Multiracial Education', Educational Research, Vol. 18, No. 3, 1976, pp. 192-200.

Jeffcoate, R., 'A Multicultural Curriculum Beyond the Orthodoxy', Trends in Education, Vol. 4, 1979, pp. 8-12, and Positive Image (Towards a Multicultural Curriculum), London, Chameleon Books, 1979a.

Jeffcoate, R., Positive Image: Towards a Multiracial Curriculum, London, Chameleon, 1979b.

Katz, J.H., White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-Racist Training, Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma Press, 1978.

Kowalczewski, 'Race and Education: Racism, Diversity and Inequality, Implications for Multicultural Education', Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1982, pp. 145-161.

Lynch, J. and Blott, C., 'Towards a Curriculum for a Multicultural Society: Evaluation of a DES Regional Course', Sunderland, November, 1982.

Lynch, J., The Multicultural Curriculum, London, Batsford, 1983.

Lynch, J., 'Human Rights, Racism and the Multicultural Curriculum', Educational Review, Summer, 1985.

Merton, R.K., 'Discrimination and the American Creed', in Merton, R.K., Sociological Ambivalence and other Essays, New York, The Free Press, 1976, pp. 189-216.

Myrdal, G., An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy, New York, Harper, 1944.

National Union of Teachers, All our Children, London, NUT, 1978 (January).

National Union of Teachers, Race, Intelligence, Education, London, NUT, 1978.

National Union of Teachers, In Black and White, London, NUT, 1979.

National Union of Teachers, Education for a Multiracial Society, London, NUT, 1982.

Nixon, J., A Teacher's Guide to Multicultural Education, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Nixon, J., 'Teaching about Race Relations', Secondary School Theatre Journal, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 16-18.

North Westminster Community School, 'Towards a Multicultural Philosophy', in The English Centre, op.cit., p.94.

Quintin Kynaston Policy on Racist Behaviour, quoted in London University Institute of Education, Racist Society: Geography Curriculum. (Papers for a Conference on 29 March, 1983), London, 1983.

Rose, A.M., 'The Causes of Prejudice', in Barron, M.L. (ed.), American Minorities, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Ruddell, D., 'Racism Awareness: An Approach for Schools', Multiracial Education, Vol.II, No.1, 1982, pp. 3-9.

Saunders, M., Multicultural Teaching, London, McGraw Hill, 1982.

Sciara, F.J. and Cunningham, D., 'Racial Prejudice in Young Children: A Case for Multicultural Education', 1982, Conference Paper for the Annual Conference of the Indiana Association for the Education of Young Children.

Shallice, J., 'Formulating an Anti-Racist Policy at the Skinners Company's School', in The English Centre, The English Curriculum: Race, London, ILEA English Centre, n.d., (1982?).

Simpson, G.E. and Yinger, J.M., Racial and Cultural Minorities, New York, Harper and Row, 1965.

Spears, A.K., 'Institutionalized Racism and the Education of Blacks', Anthropology and Education Quarterly, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1978.

Stenhouse et al., Teaching About Race Relations: Problems and Effects. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Townsend, H.E.R. and Brittan, E.M., Multiracial Education Need and Innovation, London, Evans/Methuen Educational, 1973.

Troyna, B. and Ball, W., Views from the Chalkface: School Responses to an LEA's Policy on Multiracial Education. Coventry: University of Warwick, 1985.

Twitchin, J. and Demuth, C., Multicultural Education, London, British Broadcasting Association, 1985.

United States Commission on Human Rights, Affirmative Action in the 1980s: Dismantling the Process of Discrimination, Washington, D.C., Clearing House Publications (65), 1981.

Vancouver School Board, Guidelines for the Implementation of the VSB Race Relations Policy. British Columbia, 1984.

Walkling, P., 'The Idea of a Multicultural Curriculum', Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1980, pp. 87-95.

Wyke Manor School, Bradford, 'Statement and Guidelines', December, 1984.